

**OFFICE OF THE STATE FIRE MARSHAL
Department of Forestry and Fire Protection
Fire Engineering Division**

P.O. Box 944246

SACRAMENTO, CA 94244-2460

Website: www.fire.ca.gov

(916) 445-8370

(916) 445-8458 FAX

**FIRE ALARM ADVISORY COMMITTEE****MEETING ACCOUNT
WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2003**

Committee Goal: To advise the State Fire Marshal on proposed regulations and technical issues by providing views and comments from members of industry, the public, and the fire service.

Meeting Attendees:

Mike Richwine, Division Chief, Chair
Diane Arend, Vice-Chair, SFM Building Materials Listing Program Coordinator
Pat Sanchez, Supervising Deputy
John Guhl, SFM Technical Assistant
Kim Kirkpatrick, SFM Building Materials Listing Program
Darcell Hermann, SFM Program Assistant
Brian Heyman, Division of the State Architect
Mike Novotny, OSHPD
Rick Cortina, Wheelock, Inc.
Michael Reeser, Santa Rosa Fire Equipment Serv.
Patrick Ward, Schirmer Engineering

Members Absent:

Art Arlow, Fire Alarm Consultant
Arnold Cairns, Fire Alarm Consultant
Shane Clary, Bay Alarm Co.
Scott Corrin, UC Riverside/So. Cal FPO
Howard Hopper, Underwriters Laboratories Inc.
Bill Hopple, Simplex Grinnell
Jon Kapis, Rolf Jensen and Associates

Guests:

David Secoda, on behalf of Shane Clary, Bay Alarm Co.
Ron Mahlman, on behalf of Jon Kapis, Rolf Jensen and Associates

Opening Remarks:

Division Chief, Mike Richwine called the meeting to order at 9:32 am at the SFM's Headquarters conference room in Sacramento.

Chief Richwine introduced himself and the committee followed with self-introductions. Previous minutes were approved.

The Title 19 Regulatory Process-Presentation:

Rodney Slaughter, SFM Code Development and Analysis Division introduced himself as the regulations coordinator for Title 19. He gave update on Title 19 and the process for petition of regulations. He discussed the regulatory process relative to Agenda Item #8 for NICET qualifications. The Administrative Procedures Act, Section 11340.6 states that any outside agency can petition any state agency to request the adoption, the amendment or the repeal of a regulation.

A private person or organization can send a petition to request to change regulations. Petition must include justification for making the change; amendment or repeal and the OSFM must have statutory authority to make the change. Petition requests must be addressed to Chief Randy Roxson. The Administrative Procedures Act, Section 11340.7, suggests state agencies follow a certain process regarding petitions, changes, repeals, or amendments to the regulations. The OSFM is required to respond to a petition or request within 30 days. Petitions received by SFM are initially reviewed by Chief Roxson, then on to Gini Krippner of Code Development and Analysis Division (CDAD), and last to the division chiefs. A decision will be made to either proceed or reject the petition. Decision to proceed would put petition through the regular rule making process, including public hearings.

Rodney states that there are a lot of problems with the code, with the regulation and this is an opportunity for people outside the SFM to participate in the rule making process. He added that there are other items that might affect industry that would be important to add to the rule-making calendar. The NICET certification is example of one of them. The OAL reviews for consistency and implication so the challenge for regulations people is to work things as correctly as possible to get through that process.

Rodney discussed email petition received from Scott Corrin on the NICET certification issue. After SFM review, it was found that the petition was incomplete. SFM to follow up with letter outlining what is required in resubmittal. Official response within 30 days.

Brian Heyman asked if petitions received by SFM are public record. Chief Richwine said that within the 30-day period, it would be in-house and not for public record. He stated the posting of code interpretation questions and responses on the Internet would open up government. To post petitions to Title 19 code changes or similar action for Building Standards Title 24 would give the code writing community a chance to see what others are thinking, even if that petition is rejected.

Chief Richwine suggested the Building Standards Commission and the OAL would be the appropriate place for those petitions to be public record. If the SFM denies, then there is an appeal process. After the appeal process is exhausted, the final letter of disposition is, posted with AOL register.

Richard Clark introduced himself as being with Consulting Engineers of California. He discussed the change to Title 19 regarding creating authority for fire protection engineers and NICET certified people.

Update on Patient Room Corridor Lamps:

Mike Novotny discussed the issue of consistency with OSHPD people and Los Angeles co-workers. Whether it comes through OSHPD as policy intent or through SFM, they all agree something needs to be done. Problems with inconsistency regarding nurse call have been felt in facilities up and down the state.

Chief Richwine asked if Mike Novotny would raise the issue internally with OSHPD. He responded by saying it was within SFM agency responsibility. Mike Richwine suggested that it come from a CAN or PAN. Mike Novotny said it does appear that the requirement of the nurse call lamp system is a fire alarm requirement and that it does come from SFM, but if it has to come from policy then they will start that through OSHPD.

Mike Novotny gave examples of consistency problems as: do you use part of the nurse call power in the hospitals, is it a pre-standing lamp, what color, what candela, is the detector within the patient room part of the fire alarm system when that detector activates the lamp, when it does activate the lamp does it also have to activate indicator lamps across smoke barrier doors that close, can the visual and audible signal be part of the nurse call

system. Staff themselves are not quite sure what the lamp means. What do enforcement officials enforce? Mike states that they are trying to reach a level of consistency.

The description of consistency has not been outlined. The goal of the line item is to define what consistency should be and whether or not it is appropriate to fall under the fire alarm system/nurse call system. He said the only consistency to be found is visibility of 90 feet; a patient room can be only 90 feet from a nurse station and the intent that the lamp needs to be visible. If there is a smoke barrier or area separation wall of cross quarter doors, there shall be a lamp on the opposite side from the nurse station. If the fire alarm goes off and the attendant or the nurse at the station can lean out, look down, and see the lamp, they know that in their zone across the door is where the detector is activated.

Lamps are required to be CSFM listed only if powered by the fire alarm system.

Issue of retroactive requirements for large hospitals discussed. Generally they only deal with combining with the nurse call system when they are renovating a wing. There are many points to be considered, especially from a retroactive standpoint with coordination with the industry and architecturally. The opinion of OSHPD is the desire for a consistent application.

On the issue of clarity, the committee discussed preparing an information bulletin and possibly a code change to the Building Standards. Action needed to establish criteria, emphasis on real intent, technology and secondary annunciation. SFM to do internal research on original intent. Chief Richwine requested input from nurse call industry for any opposition to removing it due to redundancy. A possible SFM information bulletin followed by a code change to remove it may then follow. A comment was made that it must be a joint effort, keeping in mind the upgrades or remodels in existing facilities and placing thresholds or triggers.

Action Item: Issue to carry over and discuss at next meeting.

Sub-Committee Update-FA Plan Review Guide/Check List:

Bill Hopple's email comments were: "I have not been able to spend time on the revisions yet. After February opens up".

Ron Mahlman from Rolf Jensen and Associates, working with Jon Kapis, discussed the checklist draft document they are working on. Input was taken from FPO's, Bruce LeClaire, Devices Committee members, Bill Hopple, Shane Clary, as well as Fire Alarm Advisory Committee. The document has the checklist, the narrative of requirements suggested be incorporated into a fire alarm submittal, the necessity for the information that is outlined, and a code reference for California Fire Code, Electrical Code, and NFPA 72. They want to provide a broad checklist with code backing with where these requirements are necessary. With a full spectrum of fire alarm systems out there, the intent is to provide a broad checklist with code backing with where these requirements are necessary. They plan to present it to the NorCal Committee and feedback was requested in hopes of presenting final document in early March 2003. They plan to give the final document to the sub-committee for review. Mike Reeser, Bill Hopple, Jon Kapis and Shane Clary are on the sub-committee.

Membership carried motion to add Jon Kapis to Plan Review Guide Committee. First made by Mike Reeser, Seconded by Rick Cortina. Jon is chair of sub-committee.

Action Item: Fire Alarm Plan Review Guide Check List Sub-Committee to review NorCal FPO document and then make recommendations to the advisory committee. State agencies will also review and compare with their internal checklist.

The intent of the final checklist is for consistency, as a useful guide for jurisdictions on what fire alarm submittal requirements should include. The document would benefit both local jurisdiction as well as contractors, where contractors would have a fair expectation of what to provide to a local jurisdiction and the locals would have a document to refer various contractors to for requirements.

Chief Richwine supports the document and will put it out to the sub-committee and to the FPO's for review and comment and then we'll ask them to bring back recommendation to the advisory committee. Then take it to the

SFM with suggestion or recommendation to publish as SFM guidelines for fire alarm approval. Additional checklists should be sent to Ron Mahlman.

Fire Alarm Advisory

January 22, 2003

Page 4 of 5

NICET Qualifications-Review Regulation Change Proposal:

Rodney Slaughter from CADD gave an update on what the administrative procedures act requires for code change proposals. Scott Corrin's proposal was received through the advisory committee and is going through the process.

A letter is going out to Scott with request to re-submit with all the required information. The clock starts at that time, followed with an internal official review by the Fire Marshal. A letter will be sent back to Scott Corrin either in support or not support. The appeal process is within 60 days, to re-petition for reconsideration, and then another period of SFM review followed by a second letter. If rejected and a code change proposal is not supported, then it goes to OAL and it is published in their regulations.

An official review process is underway so there was no discussion. There will be some movement one way or another on this proposal, which will be communicated to all the advisory committees. There is a lot of information that has to come back and research to be done, how it impacts the business and profession code, if there is going to be a statutory change, if it's going to be in conflict with state law. Scott Corrin and Bill Hopple have been informed.

Replacing System Control Units:

Bill Hopple's email read: "I requested input from other memberships, associations to suggest when fire alarm control units shall be considered for replacement. Considerations are age of equipment, whether it is still SFM listed, whether parts are available, and if upgrades or expansion to the existing system is part of the project scope. More input needed before I put together a draft document."

Comment was made that Bill is looking at it strictly from a standpoint of an existing fire alarm system and at what time do you replace a fire alarm control panel. Suggestion was made to also consider at what time should a fire alarm control panel be replaced when you have modifications to an existing fire alarm system. The question was asked whether or not Bill would address just replacing a fire alarm system or replacing a fire alarm system when there is work to be done on the building. Comment from committee that it is an issue of consistency, because there are a lot of inconsistencies as to how that is being applied out in the field from jurisdiction to jurisdiction.

Mike Richwine made reference to prior meeting minutes, page 3, and explained that apparently this came from NEMA requesting verbiage to present to the committee. The question or concern is when changing out a control panel and compatibility is not an issue does the rest of the system need to be brought up to code. Jon Kapis' thought was that it was a service, survivability issue.

There is precedence in regulations in dealing with compatibility that might apply to OSHPD. The question is "when is compatibility not an issue". Committee discussed it as perhaps a service as well as a construction issue.

Chef Richwine asked for clarification on issue regarding NEMA's request for verbiage in prior minutes. Base understanding is to have statewide consistency and guidance regarding renovating and installing strobes/horns.

Issue to include attendance of fire officials in the advisory committee has been addressed and will be presented to Cal Chiefs. Committee discussed the email comments from Bill Hopple. Bill said more work must be done prior to completing a draft document. Committee also discussed the contractor's dilemmas. Committee to hold discussion of issue until Bill Hopple returns with a draft report to the committee.

Action Item: Add new business item – calendar upcoming committee meetings.

BML Update:

Diane Arend stated SFM has had a 45% increase in applications from 6 months prior. We are at about 60 to 90 days turn around time. Statistics show 27% increase overall. Renewal Notices will be mailed out with May 1st deadline for return. Renewed listings will be posted on Internet by July 1, 2003. A placeholder has been placed on the OAL calendar for internal use for a proposed Non-Technical Revision fee increase from the current fee of \$25.00. Code analysis will follow to determine the additional cost. It will be justified in a regulation package with

the analysis and the advisory committee will be kept in the loop. Application turn around time, complete application package submittals, accounting office process, and the new BML database was discussed.

Chief Richwine stated that some of the things we're doing with all of the advisory committees is we've asked code development and analysis to come in and give a presentation and an update on what is going on with the NFIRS which is replacing CFIRS. We want to provide linkage to that process. Some of the other committees are reviewing the data elements, either reported like method of extinguishments, so if there is some kind of alarm reporting requirements and you would like to see that data collected, then let that division know and they can work to incorporate those things so that information may be collected in a specific jurisdiction or on a statewide basis. It is a voluntary reporting system. We don't get the response from the fire service so hopefully this new system will make it easier for them and we will start collecting some real data from local agencies and get some statewide trends on what is going on in the fire world.

Issue of Technical Service Bulletins (TSAM's) was discussed. Chief Richwine declined suggestion to post on SFM website.

Code Interpretations:

New process has been initiated. Joe Garcia is now overseeing code interpretation committee. For fire alarm questions, after the committee answers the particular question, they will send their response to Ron Dalton, President of CAFAA for comment. CAFAA has 10 days to respond back to Joe Garcia with their input. The committee will then decide if they choose incorporate CAFAA's comments or not. Chief Richwine stated that CAFAA is representing by virtue of their membership, the fire alarm advisory committee and the industry. He commented on the SFM's effort to involve the advisory committee in the process of reviewing and providing comment on the code interpretation.

Set Next Meeting:

The date of the next meeting was tentatively set for 9:30 a.m. Wednesday, April 30, 2003 at the State Fire Marshal's headquarters conference room in Sacramento. (Amendment due to Governor Davis's Budget letter dated 1/29/2003 to all state agencies, future meetings of advisory committees are limited to one annual meeting).

The meeting was adjourned.

Meeting Minutes Developed by:
DARCELL HERMANN
Office of the State Fire Marshal
PO Box 944246, Sacramento, CA 94244-2460